SECRET

16 May 1961

Towards a Clarification of OUN/BANDERA Operations. Subject:

1. Answers to a number of questions from responsible OUN/BANDERA members are needed in order to clarify certain unclear aspects of their contacts in Poland and the Ukraine. Some questions follow below;-

a. Since the inception of the OUN/B-German operational relationship, who were the chief OUN/B lisison officials in contact with the German service? Names, dates, and place in the operational picture.

b. True names and underground pseudonyms of all OUM/B bodies patched, or washed out in the OUM/B-German operation. The be asked to provide data and dates as to when and how bodies came to West Germany and to provide written accounts preground careers. (It is standard OUM/B practice to have filtree from the E at Ab give a biographay and military regard to the three agents sent in 1958 into Poland and OUM/B files must have reports on their backgrounds).

c. What did the OUM/B spokesmen tell the Germans about;—

a)OUM/B and the Italians.

b) OUM/B and the British.

c) ZPUHVR and the Americans. trained, dispatched, or washed out in the OUN/B-German operation. The CUN'B should be asked to provide data and dates as to when and how these OUN/B bodies came to West Germany and to provide written accounts of their underground careers. (It is standard GUN/B practice to have each UPA exfiltree from the East to give a biographay and military history; in regard to the three agents sent in 1958 into Poland and the Ukraine, OUM/S files must have reports on their backgrounds).

d. What was the personal attitude of each OUN A member in contact the German service toward Myron MATVIEYXO? Bid any OUM/B member disappear from the operational scene in Germany on or about the time that MATVIETKO came up on the air in the Ukraine? How did LENKAVSKY, WASHKOVICH, and others react to MATVIETKO's admission that upon arrival in the Ukraine (1951) he immediately went to the Soviet security organs?

- e. OUN/B spokesmen should be asked to give their German contacts original-lagguage copies of all W/T traffic with MATVIEYKO since This traffic should be analyzied in order t o learn how the RIS played MATVIETEO, how MATVIETEO manipulated BANDERA, etc. At the same time, the MATVIETED traffic should be compared with the CIA operational traffic with the same underground complex (OKHRYMOVICH) in order to get a complete picture of RIS intentions and tactics.
- f. OUN/B spokesmen should be asked to provide the Germans #1 OUM/B has, including exhaustive debriefing reports, from SKOB. SKOB in all probability is closely tied in with MATVIEYRO. Did he confess to OUN/B Shat he, SKOB, was sent by the RIS, or was he unwitting as to MATVIEYRO's involvement with theRIS? Did the OUN/B consider SKOB clean or dirty?
- g. OUN/B spokesmen should be required to provide names and other identifying data on & I their alleged assets in Poland and the Ukraine-especially the support points, addresses, etc., used inking OUN/B German operational collaboration.

h. Who in the OUN/B operational minimum milieu has reported SEGIL

(to the German authorities) operational pitches fr m the RIS, andwho has not reported such pitches? In view of MATVIEYKO's being under RIS control, it is logical to expect that some key men in the OUN/B operational group were approached by the RIS. Who was closest to Mrs. MATVIEYKO in Munich? Who guarded and guided her? Did Mrs. MATVIEYKO have any sort of communication with her husband? Did the OUN/B operational traffic with MATVIEYKO ever refer to Mrs. MATVIEIKO? In what manner? Did Mrs. MATVIEIKO ever receive any private mail from her husband, or did any visitor bring any oral or written message from him?

- i. A close study should be made of the political content of the MATVIEYKO traffic. Such items as:
  - a) What did MATVIEYKO say the homeland underground thinks about BANDERA and BANDERA's rank in the underground?
  - b) What did the MATVIEYKO say politically about OKHRIMOVICH, HORNOVYY, POLITAVA, KOVAL, and other underground leaders?
  - c) What ideological line was MATVIEYKO feeding to BANDERA?
- j. OUN/BANDERA spekesman, especially Stepan LENKAVSKY (who in the past is alleged to have been worried about certain OUN/B excesses and pelicies), should be asked to review and provide old SB (Sluzhba Bespeky) reports on the liquidation or disappearance of;

Vasyl BULAVSKY (killed)
DEMYD-CHYZHEVSKY (killed)
Fru MOROZ (killed)
STELMASHCHUK (killed)
Andriy PECHERA (killed)
Dr. HORBOVYY's sudden appearance and disappearance in the West.
Lyuba POTELYTSKA (allegedly killed)
Prof. PETROV (kidnapped or killed)

OUN/B spokesmen, especially Stepan LENKAVSKY, should be asked to clarify the role of Myron MATVISIKO in the death of these alleged Soviet agents. They should be asked to name the members of the boyivka members involved in these deaths, their current wheresbouts, and explain how one of them allegedly emigrated to the U.S., and from their redefected to the Soviet Ukraine, despite thehis involvement in the killing of alleged Soviet agents.

- k. On the death of BANDERA, the attitudes of individual OUN/B members should be assessed. Who says it was suicide, and who says it was an RIS job? What are the findingsof German investigative organs? What does Mrs. MATVIEYKO say?
- 1. It is logical to suppose, in view of the priority that the RIS gives the OUN/B as a target, that OUN/B has been penetrated by the RIS. CE efforts should be made to find that penetration.